

Approved For Release 2002/05/08 : CIA-RDP78-06365A001200020012-5
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

CONFIDENTIAL

TO : Director of Training
 THRU : Chief/Plans and Policy Staff
 FROM :
 SUBJECT: Supervisors' Reorientation

DATE: 24 April 1964

25X1A9a

This document part of classified integrated file. NAME CHECK required prior to individual classification action.

JOB NO. BOX NO. FILE NO. DOC. NO. 8 NO CHANGE
 IN CLASS/ DECLASS/ CLASS CHANGED TO: TS S RET. JUST 2
 NEXT REV DATE 2002 REV DATE 11/12 REVIEWER 0199 TYPE DOC. 02
 NO. PGS 2 CREATION DATE ORG COMP 11 OF 11 ORG CLASS 5
 REV CLASS C REV COORD. AUTH: HR 70-3

1. Review of Critiques I have quickly reviewed the critiques that have been received by this date. There are still a few that have not been received, and I have not carefully tabulated the others of those that are available. However, there seems to be no doubt that the majority sentiment is that the 10 April program is considered worthwhile and was generally well received. In the constructive criticism vein it is also apparent that the majority sentiment is that the program could be shortened without the loss of any very significant content and that indeed a net gain should be realized from a refinement and boiling down of the substance. For further planning purposes I would suggest that particular attention be paid to the OTR critiques, which I believe covered all that any of the others did and, in addition, have much more in the way of specific suggestions.

2. Conclusion and Recommendation My personal reaction at this time is generally consistent with the major theme of the critiques as I interpreted them. I believe that the idea is valid that the program should be continued to include all supervisors in the various components as well as the balance of the DDS supervisors. I am stronger than ever in my earlier conviction that a shorter program with less speeches would be preferable and that some specific emphasis on follow-up through our established management training program should be made at these presentations. In order to shorten, one needs either to reduce the length of the individual speeches or reduce the number of speakers, or a combination of both. I believe that the most effective way would be to eliminate the speeches by Finance, Medical, Security, and Personnel and to incorporate the best fifteen to twenty minutes of each of these into a single presentation that would be given by the deputy director whose subordinates comprise the particular audience. This could probably best be done by a project officer who would collaborate with an appropriate staff assistant to each of the deputy directors

-2-

In reviewing the best of these prepared lectures, adapting and slanting them to the appropriate deputy and his area of activities. There, of course, may be some difficulty in getting the concurrence of the other deputy directors to make these speeches, but at least they should be on hand, I think, to introduce and endorse the presentation that will be made by his designee. This particular presentation would follow an opening by the DCI or the DDCI. Our filmed recording of the 10 April running could be used if a live performance is not possible. This opening would be followed by approximately 1½ to two hours, perhaps with a break, by the appropriate deputy director to his "troops". I would further suggest continuing the panel for approximately 1½ hours, the composition to be just as on 10 April with the substitution of the appropriate deputy director for the DDS, though I think it would be quite acceptable to have Colonel White in addition to the featured deputy director each time. It would probably be best to have the lunch break between the presentations and the panel.



25X1A9a